

## **REMARKS**

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed August 17, 2004. Claims 1-36 were pending in the application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 13, 19, 25, and 31. Accordingly, claims 1-36 remain pending in the application.

Claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Knight et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,314,460, hereinafter “Knight”) in view of Ito et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,581,709, hereinafter “Ito”). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Original claims 1, 13, and 25 have been amended to clarify Applicant’s claimed invention. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 13, and 25 may be found at page 5, line 14 through page 6, line 21 and Fig. 2 of Applicant’s specification.

In regard to claim 1 (as amended), Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest “using a plurality of component-specific data collectors to determine component information for the at least one host adaptor, the at least one switch, and the at least one I/O device in the system.” Knight discloses (e.g., at col. 8, lines 24-31; col. 14, lines 10-40; and col. 18, lines 12-32) the use of agent software on local hosts to acquire network topology and attribute information for storage networks. As disclosed at col. 18, lines 12-32 and Fig. 10, however, Knight’s local agent uses a single network daemon, not a plurality of component-specific data collectors, to gather network information from storage adapters. Furthermore, Knight does not teach or suggest that “each of the plurality of component-specific data collectors is configured to determine component information for a specific type of component using a respective application program interface (API) supplied by a respective component vendor” as recited by Applicant’s amended claim 1. Instead, Knight’s network daemon appears to use a homogeneous or uniform approach to acquiring information from storage adapters.

For at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 13, and 25 (as amended) are patentably distinguished over the cited references. Claims 2-12, 14-24, and 26-36 are dependent claims which include additional limitations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-36 are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.. Deposit Account No. 501505\5681-79900\BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin  
Reg. No. 33,929  
AGENT FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.  
P.O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767-0398  
Phone: (512) 853-8840  
Date: November 17, 2004